DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 575 CS 201 537

AUTHOR Knudson, Jerry
TITLE Whatever Became of "The Pursuit of Happiness"? The U.S. Press and Social Revolution in Latin America.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (57th, San Diego, California, August 18-21, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Civil Rights; Communications; *Journalism; *Media Research; *News Reporting; *Press Opinion; *Revolution; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Latin America

ABSTRACT

This paper examines treatment by the U.S. press of the Mexican, Cuban, and Chilean revolutions from a historical perspective, both using original research and synthesizing the research of others. On balance, the U.S. media have reported or commented on Latin American social revolutions mainly by exploiting sensation and ridicule. Economic interests probably predispose the U.S. press toward a conservative stance. Perhaps more significant, however, is the cultural conception of individual reporters and editors that the U.S. political system of representative democracy is inextricably bound up with the economic system of private ownership of property. Most U.S. reporters have a difficult time covering social revolution simply because it is alien to their experience. They tend to regard the world as a giant police court where property rights take precedence over human rights. (Author/TO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 095575

# WHATEVER BECAME OF 'THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS'?

# THE U.S. PRESS AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA

By Jerry Knudson

Department of Journalism

Temple University

Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

Paper Presented At
International Communications Division
Association for Education in Journalism
San Diego, Calif.
August 1974

CS 201 537

The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their property... Whensoever therefore the Legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society; and either by ambition, fear, folly or corruption, endeavour to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of any other an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people; by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands...

-- John Locke, Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent, and End of Civil-Government, 1690

We hold these truths to be self-evident:-- That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

-- Thomas Jefferson, Declaration of Independence, 1776

Governments may come and go in Latin America, but one thing remains constant in the U.S. press--a seemingly implacable hostility toward social change elsewhere in the hemisphere, whether accompanied by violence or not. Anyone examining the record can find that newspapers and magazines in the United States have resorted mainly to sensation and ridicule in reporting or commenting upon the social revolutions which occurred in Mexico after 1910, Bolivia after 1952, Cuba after 1959, Peru after 1968 and Chile between 1970 and 1973.

In fact, we in the United States have so little concept of the meaning of the word "revolution" that we must be redundant and say "social revolution" to distinguish profound social change from a simple coup d'etat, whether palace or barracks revolt. Octavio Paz, Mexican poet and philosopher, has noted that until the eighteenth century the word "revolution" meant only "the rotation of heavenly bodies, thus illustrating the old cyclic idea of time; after the eighteenth century 'revolution' meant sudden change, the substitution of one system for another."[1] In this sense, we are not even aware of our own history, for in the judgment of most historians the events of 1776-1783 meant little more than a change of rulers: not home rule, but who should rule at home.[2] The American experience, then, was a successful insurrection, not a revolution, and this has clouded our understanding of social change elsewhere.[3]

In his book Listen, Yankee, for which he was reviled, the late sociologist C. Wright Mills thought it impossible for U.S. reporters to cover a social revolution adequately simply because the phenomenon is completely alien to their experience. He wrote:

> ...many North American journalists simply do not know how to understand and to report a revolution. If it is a real revolution--and Cuba's is certainly that--to report it involves more than the ordinary journalist's routine. It requires that the journalist abandon many of the cliches and habits which now make up his very craft. It certainly requires that he know something in detail about the great variety of leftwing thought and action in the world of today.[4]

Mills also blamed newspaper editors for their "demand for violent headlines [that] restrict and shape the copy journalists produce. Editors and journalists tend to feel that the United States public would rather read about executions than about new lands put into cultivation. They print what they think is the salable commodity."[5] Mills implied that U.S. newsmen, with their traditional up-the-ladder training, tend to cover the world as if it were a giant police court--with good guys and bad guys and themselves in the judge's seat.

Are these charges justified? Fourteen years after Mills wrote his indictment, the Cuban revolution is alive and well; the Chilean revolution is not. From a historical perspective, this paper will examine treatment by the U.S. press of the Mexican, Cuban and Chilean revolutions, using

original research and synthesizing other analyses whenever possible. After a long acquaintance with the source material, the writer does not feel that the examples presented are atypical.[6]

## MEXICO: 'SAVAGERY WITHOUT PURPOSE'

For the Mexican revolution which began in 1910, we shall single out how the U.S. press dealt with its central figure--Emiliano Zapata. In many respects, Francisco I. Madero, the political figurehead of the movement which finally toppled the 35-year-old dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz in 1911, was peripheral to the Mexican revolution. The core of the Mexican upheaval was not in the struggle for political power in Mexico City but in the stubborn resistance of the peasants of the state of Morelos, who crystalized the inchoate yearnings of a people in revolt with their demand for land and dignity. Their leader was Zapata. Today there are more statues of Zapata in Mexico than of any other national hero,[7] but how did the U.S. press at the time report and comment upon the zapatista uprising?[8]

Almost without exception in American periodicals, Zapata was regarded as nothing more than a bandit, along with Pancho Villa, his northern counterpart. Edwin Emerson, a correspondent who had covered the Russo-Japanese war, described Zapata and his men in The Independent as a "horde

of outlaws" whose "so-called 'campaign' [was] marked by acts of unbridled murder, arson and rapine."[9] The Literary Digest ridiculed Zapata and his "handful of followers, who preferred the life of bandits to honest toil..."[10] Harper's Weekly in its news columns also deplored "the slouchiness, the laziness, the stupidity, and the cowardliness of the average Mexican..."[11] The New York Times borrowed a phrase from the conservative Mexico City newspapers to title an editorial ATTILA OF THE SOUTH, which stated in part: "Zapata seems to belong to some other century. Savage, boastful, fond of loading his person with diamonds and gold, polygamous, a patriarch of banditry, he fulfills the book-and-boy idea of a robber."[12] In its news columns, the New York Times solemnly reported: "Zapata's famous specialty was to raid small towns in states near Morelos and steal young women for his harem. He is known to have had over fifty young women in his harem."[13]

Many of these spurious stories about Zapata can be traced to the wild imagination of Harry H. Dunn, an American writer who claimed to have ridden with Zapata but who actually never met him nor any of his top generals.[14] Borrowing also from the concocted stories of the Mexican writer Antonio D. Melgarejo,[15] Dunn ground out fake zapatista atrocity reports for a gullible U.S. press.[16] The New York Sun, for example, repeated without attribution Dunn's tall tale of Zapata staging a bullfight and tying the town's mayor, a

personal enemy, to a stake to be gored in the center of the ring.[17] Dunn later published the first "biography" of Zapata in English, which regaled its readers with such tidbits as Zapata sending back to Mexico City an envoy's head sewed to a stuffed monkey's body.[18]

Although Dunn wrote in the style of the pulp magazines, his lies filtered throughout the U.S. press. The New York World, for example, seriously described Zapata in 1914:

> He is as impressive as a gaunt, fiery-eyed, snarling tiger-man who has committed some monstrous crime, or as a repulsive serpent is impressive, not because of anything within them latently noble, beneficent or useful, but by reason of malign power for harm which they hold.[19]

Others considered the Mexican revolution, in which more than one million people died, as quite a lark. A writer for Collier's, for example, after relating how he had been shot at, concluded his article, "Anyway, it was a great scamper, and something to tell at the club with the walnuts and wine."[20]

Less than a month before the assassination of Zapata, the New York Times demanded in an editorial "the utter downfall, the permanent absence, or the extinction of Zapata."[21] That demand was met when the guerrilla leader was killed by deception on April 9, 1919. Because of the lies spread about him in the press, both in Mexico and in the United States, it would require almost a quarter of a century for the historic Zapata to emerge on this side of the Rio Grande. Edgcumb Pinchon, who wrote the first serious biography of Zapata in

English, published in 1941, noted that the man who embodied the Mexican revolution was "the butt of a campaign of vilification unequaled in the history of modern journalism."[22]

## CUBA: 'MARXISTS AND MADNESS'

One may object that the reporting on Zapata occurred more than half a century ago, before Upton Sinclair published The Brass Check in 1919 and before journalistic style and ethics improved. But have they improved? When it became clear that the Cuban revolution beginning in 1959 was going to be a genuine social revolution and not simply another of the "inoffensive exultations... of the Caribbean," in the words of Bolivian writer Augusto Céspedes,[23] most U.S. reporters and editorial writers did an abrupt about-face on Fidel Castro.

In the compilation of Michael J. Francis,[24] we have the following. In early 1960, the New York Daily News, in an editorial headed THE GUY SEEMS TO BE NUTS, declared that Castro appeared to be "a paranoiac, a megalomaniac, or both."[25] William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in his column in the San Francisco Examiner, wrote that "the least any team of psychiatrists would call him [Castro] is unbalanced. And anyone who is that close to being demented is dangerous."[26] The Philadelphia Inquirer called for a "restoration of sanity to Cuba."[27] The Miami Herald decided, "Every symptom

suggested that Fidel Castro is as balmy as the tradewinds."[28] And the Detroit News called Castro a "loony."[29]

The assumption of expertise on every subject under the sun, which afflicts editorial writers everywhere, did not stop short in this case at psychiatric diagnosis--and by long distance, at that. This sampling also suggests that editorialists tend to read mainly other editorial pages. But most sadly, as the compiler of this selection of quotations pointed out, "many of the papers had to turn to irrationality as an explanation for the policies of Castro."[30] How could one be sane and a Marxist?

Jules Dubois, Latin American correspondent for the Chicago Tribune who once had championed Castro, also deserted him, declaring in a speech in early 1960:

> Contributing to this unhappy situation in Cuba is the heavy dose of Castro-oil which is being administered to the people--and, mind you, many of them swallow it with delight--by the bearded premier in the most concerted and concentrated brainwashing operation in contemporary Latin American history.31

This note of ridicule and arrogance ran through almost everything published in the United States on revolutionary Cuba. Maurice Zeitlin and Robert Scheer studied eight leading mass-circulation American magazines during the first 22 months of the Cuban revolution. They found "not one article [which] dealt with the positive social and economic achievements of the revolution for the Cuban people, claimed by the Revolutionary Government. In all our reading we found only

three paragraphs that even touched on those achievements. And they appeared in contexts designed to frighten rather than to enlighten."[32]

In press reaction to the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion of April 1961, Neal D. Houghton found, "Almost the only implications of official or press regret were expressions of sadness that the job was 'bungled,' that it did not 'succeed'--and that a well-meaning young President got caught and got a 'bloody nose.'"[33] There was almost no discussion of the international lawlessness of the action by the United States in training and sending in Brigade 2506.[34]

U.S. coverage of the Bay of Pigs invasion and the later Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 revealed another disturbing development: the spectacle of major U.S. newspapers meekly subservient to the government whose actions they were supposed to report and comment upon. James Aronson has charged that a "large section of [the] communications industry... for the most part has served voluntarily as a virtual propaganda arm of government since the end of World War II."[35] In both the Bay of Pigs and missile episodes, key publications--unable to distinguish between national security and national interest--withheld vital information from the American public. Dom Bonafede of the Miami Herald admitted later, "We were middlemen, perhaps even dupes, being used in a propaganda exercise."[36] And White House aide Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., who asked Gilbert Harrison of

the New Republic to kill a story on invasion preparations, recalled later:

> Obviously its publication in a responsible magazine would cause trouble, but could the government properly ask an editor to suppress the truth? Defeated by the moral issue, I handed the article to the President, who instantly read it and expressed the hope that it could be stopped. Harrison accepted the suggestion and without questions--a patriotic act which left me oddly uncomfortable.37

One wonders only why a historian of the stature of Schlesinger should feel "oddly" uncomfortable at such a procedure.

Herbert S. Matthews of the New York Times, following in the footsteps of Lincoln Steffens and John Reed as a sympathetic observer of a foreign social revolution, was unique among his species at the time of the Cuban revolution.[38] The Matthews story is too complex to discuss fully here,[39] but it should be noted that the New York Times, after controversy developed, shunted Matthews to an editorial-writing desk and refused to print any of his reports of his later trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1967--when U.S. readers were starving for information on what was happening on the island.[40]

It should also be noted that the U.S. press treated Matthews himself unfairly. For example, Thurston N. Davis, S.J., discussing Matthews' reporting of Cuba in America, gave a classic example of quoting someone out of context. Matthews was quoted as having written in his book, The Yoke and the Arrows:

> I would never dream of hiding my own bias or denying it. I did not do so during the Spanish Civil War and I do not do so now [1961]. In my credo, as I said before, the journalist is not one who must be free of bias or opinions or feelings. Such a newspaperman would be a pitiful specimen, to be despised rather than admired.41

But Father Davis neglected to include an integral part of Matthews' statement, which immediately followed the selection quoted above:

> There is only one test that means anything, only one quality that the reader has a right to demand--the truth as the man sees it and all the truth. He must never change or suppress that truth; he must never present as the truth anything that he does not honestly believe to be true.42

In summary, Lee Lockwood described the track record of the U.S. press on the Cuban revolution as of 1967:

> Lamentably, little of... reality is being communicated to us by the American press, which in its coverage of Cuba has been, to use the kindest words possible, woefully inadequate. In general it reports only the negative aspects--the economic difficulties, the exodus of Cubans to the United States--and remains silent about everything else. It ridicules Castro's speeches and reduces him personally to a Hitleresque caricature. It consistently publishes as unchallenged fact the most absurd rumors that emanate daily from the embittered Cuban exile community. The net result to the American reader is an image of a Cuba troubled and torn and of a government on the brink of momentary collapse.43

If one concedes this assessment to be accurate, was the Cuban story willful misrepresentation or the result of simple ignorance? Howard Cline, late director of the Hispanic Foundation at the Library of Congress, repeatedly pointed

out that only six Ph.D. dissertations on Cuban history had been done in the United States before Castro came to power. And Marvin Alisky found that during the last days of Fulgencio Batista's rule, "Wire service dispatches depended in part upon rewritten leads from the unreliable Havana press."[44] Language was and is a problem. The UPI got into trouble when a staff member with a six-week Berlitz course in Spanish quoted Castro as saying on December 3, 1961, that he had been a Marxist-Leninist since his university days, when in fact the Cuban premier had said exactly the opposite.[45]

The UPI has not had a good record on Cuba. The wire service reported Castro dead in the Sierra Maestra before the Matthews interview of February 1957 proved otherwise. And this writer remembers seeing a promotional poster in the UPI New York offices in 1971 which bore a large picture of Fidel Castro with these words in large-face type: HELP PUT CASTRO IN HIS PLACE. TAKE UPI. Again, we have the arrogance of a U.S. news-selling firm deciding what Castro's place should be, while its younger brethren are chided for practicing advocacy journalism.

## CHILE: 'DELUSION AND SELF-DESTRUCTION'

It is perhaps too early to assess dispassionately the reportage of the Chilean experiment in the legal and democratic implantation of Marxist socialism which ended with

the overthrow and murder of President Salvador Allende on September 11, 1973. Nevertheless, many articles critical of U.S. coverage and comment have already appeared.[46] In life and death, Allende (or anyone who tried to defend him) was ridiculed by the U.S. press. For example, this writer reported in a letter to The Quill the results of a conference on Chile held at Temple University in March 1973. At the conference, leading U.S. specialists on Chile presented a quite different picture of what was happening there than the one found in the U.S. press.[47] William F. Buckley, Jr. responded in one of his columns, "There is no apparent end to the enthusiasm in academic circles for any left-wing national adventure." He called the work of the scholars presented at the conference "propaganda" served up by a "gang."[48]

After the death of Allende, Buckley wrote another column attacking the dead president on the most personal and unsubstantiated grounds: "Allende spread a Barmecidal banquet among his people, offering everybody everything... while [he], between speeches, boozed and debauched, in his regal quarters, with Faroukian devotion: finally interrupted by his patient colonels." Lest this be taken as the opinion of only one ultra-conservative columnist and not indicative of press attitudes generally in the United States, let it be noted that the Philadelphia Bulletin copy editor who handled the column went down to the tenth of twelve paragraphs for his

headline: ALLENDE... PHILANDERING, PLUNDERING FAKE. And the cutline under a one-column picture of Allende accompanying the column repeated, "...boozed and debauched."[49] One can find similarly lurid headlines and cutlines accompanying this Buckley column in newspapers throughout the United States.

John Pollock, in a study of New York Times coverage of the Chilean military takeover, noted that Allende alive had been described as an "acrobat" and "adroit juggler," dodging like a "clever" and "light-tripping fox," while General Augusto Pinochet, head of the military junta after Allende's death, was described as "tall," "powerfully built," "quiet and businesslike," "disciplined," "tough" and with a "sense of humor."[50]

Television scarcely did a more creditable job of reporting the Chilean tragedy. Steve Delaney of NBC, for example, reported from Santiago on September 24, 1973, that General Pinochet was engaged in a "housecleaning"--implying that undesirable elements were being swept away in the purges which followed the coup--and that the military junta was "middle-of-the-road." Delaney may have been physically present in Chile, but in the hit-and-run tradition of many foreign correspondents, he was not in touch with the facts. At the time of his report, or within two days, alleged leftists were being executed, foreigners and Jews terrorized, Chile's largest labor union abolished, all Marxist political parties

outlawed, university departments closed, rectors fired and books publicly burned.[51]

The U.S. press also walked away from the Chilean story leaving many questions unanswered. Among them:

(1) Did Allende commit suicide or was he murdered? In the January 1974 issue of The Quill, Robert N. Pierce still referred to the "suicide" of Allende, more than three months after the first confused reports of the coup.[52] Yet the New York Times had reported the statement by Allende's widow that he could not have committed suicide because eye-witnesses had reported to her that his body bore multiple bullet wounds.[53] Tom Wicker wrote in the New York Times on March 10, 1974, that it "now seems certain" that Allende was murdered, and Gabriel García Márquez, citing "a witness who asked me not to give his name," described the death scene in Harper's Magazine:

> As soon as he [Allende] saw him [General Javier Palacios] appear on the stairs [of La Moneda, the government palace], Allende shouted at him: 'Traitor!' and shot him in the hand.... the President died in an exchange of shots with that gang. Then all the other officers, in a caste-bound ritual, fired on the body. Finally a noncommissioned officer smashed in his face with the butt of his rifle.[54]

This account by García Márquez, a distinguished Colombian novelist, was corroborated by Mexican journalist Manuel Mejido, who covered the coup, but their findings were not reported in U.S. newspapers.[55]

(2) Why did the U.S. press almost completely ignore the death on September 23, 1973, of Pablo Neruda, Chilean poet and 1971 winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature? A study of nine random newspapers revealed that the death of Pablo Picasso elicited ten times as much coverage as that of Neruda, called by some critics the greatest poet of the twentieth century and by others the greatest poet ever to have written in the Spanish language. Moreover, the scant references to the death of Neruda dwelled more on his political beliefs than on his poetic achievements. As far as getting a good press in the United States was concerned, it seems to have been Neruda's misfortune that he was an active member of the Chilean Communist Party and titled his last book of poems, Incitation to the Murder of Nixon and in Praise of the Chilean Revolution.[56]

(3) Was the U.S. government directly involved in the Chilean coup d'etat? American newspapers decided not, a priori, and then dropped the matter. House Resolution 542, calling for an investigation into possible CIA involvement in the Chilean coup and the death of Allende, also was quietly shelved, with no notice from the U.S. press.[57]

(4) How many people were killed in the fighting and later by summary executions and torture? European newspapers printed estimates of victims ranging from 5,000 to 15,000, whereas the New York Times published the official figure of the Chilean military junta, the unbelievable total of 197.[58]

John Barnes of Newsweek first broke the story in this country of the true extent of the carnage, but a debate over the accuracy of his report quickly sputtered out in the pages of the Wall Street Journal.[59]

Thus, one cannot conclude that it was the violence of the Mexican and Cuban revolutions which alienated the U.S. press, for in the Chilean case the peaceful and orderly social change attempted by Allende brought only abuse in the U.S. press, and the same press tended to accept without concern the violence and brutality of the present ruling military junta to suppress social change.

For that matter, Americans have forgotten their own violent origins, if indeed recent generations ever accepted those origins at all. Richard Maxwell Brown, writing on "Violence and the American Revolution," concluded, "The long-range era of the American Revolution has at last come to an end, for it seems that the Revolution now has little impact as an inspiration for dissent and reform whether peaceable or violent."[60] It was, of course, not always so. Beatrice F. Hyslop, after an exhaustive study of treatment of the French Revolution of 1789 in U.S. newspapers, concluded: "American experience led American papers to expect violence and some bloodshed. Uprisings against arbitrary power were accepted as necessary, and the blood of oppressed citizens was condoned in 1789."[61]

Why, then, this aversion in the U.S. press of today toward social revolution, with or without violence? One cannot rule out selfish motivation. As C. Wright Mills observed, "If U.S. businesses adversely affected by the [Cuban] revolution do not coordinate your news of Cuba, business as a system of interests (which includes the media of mass communication) may nonetheless be a controlling factor in what you are able to know about Cuba today."[62]

Further, perhaps many workers as well as owners of the press are prisoners of their own cultural conditioning. It seems to me that the hostility in the U.S. press today toward social revolution--in Latin America or elsewhere, with or without violence--stems from the mistaken notion that the American political system of representative democracy is inextricably bound up with the economic system of private ownership of property.[63] This notion has little basis in historical fact.[64] John Locke justified the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England on the basis of life, liberty and property. But to read about social revolution in the pages of most U.S. newspapers today, one would never know that Thomas Jefferson, in a stroke of genius that would capture forever the American dream, changed Locke's word "property" to "the pursuit of happiness."[65]

## FOOTNOTES

1. Rita Gilbert, "The New Latin Wave: Octavio Paz," interview in Intellectual Digest (December 1972), 74. Paz noted that the Chinese have no word for "revolution" and had to describe the experience of their country after 1948 as "Change of Mandate from Heaven."

2. Most historians today accept the thesis that the American Revolution involved little social change. The thesis was first advanced by J. Franklin Jameson, The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement (Princeton, 1926). Carl Becker coined the phrase about home rule in The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760-1776 (Madison, 1909), 22.

3. There is a growing awareness of this. James Kirby Martin, for example, titled his recent book Men in Rebellion (New Brunswick, 1973), thus avoiding the word "revolution." On the tragicomic side, Russell Baker in his "Sunday Observer" column of The New York Times Magazine (June 30, 1974) suggested that in celebrating the Fourth of July nowadays we should render homage to George III rather than to George Washington since the United States after 200 years has become the imperial power suppressing revolutionary movements around the globe.

4. C. Wright Mills, Listen, Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba (New York, 1960), 10.

5. Ibid., 9-10.

6. For four years, the author of this paper taught a course on "Twentieth Century Latin American Social and Economic Revolutions" in the Department of History at the University of Kentucky. He is the author of "The Press and the Mexican Revolution of 1910," Journalism Quarterly (Winter 1969), 760-766; "The Press and the Bolivian National Revolution," Journalism Monographs, No. 31 (November 1973), and "Allende Falls, The Press Reacts," The Masthead (Spring 1974), 50-56.

7. Betty Kirk, Covering the Mexican Front: The Battle of Europe versus America (Norman, 1942), 118.

8. A few articles did penetrate the significance of Zapata's struggle. See, for example, "Zapata and Mexico's Agrarian Revolution," The American Review of Reviews (November 1914), 630-632, which had the journalistic enterprise to translate and publish one of Zapata's manifestos first printed in the Mexican newspaper Voz de Juárez on August 20, 1914. Another favorable view was presented by William Gates in "Zapata--Protector of Morelos," The World's Work (April 1919), 654-665. Gates pointed out (p. 663), "Our fundamental difficulty facing the Mexican question is: lack of information."

9. Edwin Emerson, "Mexican Bandits at Close View," The Independent (August 1, 1912), 234 and 238.

10. "Is This the End of Emiliano Zapata, the Mexican Rebel?" The Literary Digest (July 5, 1919), 79.

11. Richard Barry, "Zapata--The Mexican Attila," Harper's Weekly (January 20, 1912), 8. Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, "The Disruption of Mexico," ibid. (October 19, 1912), referred (p. 7) to "Zapata's bloodthirsty hordes..." Harper's Weekly did present other views, however. Allene Tupper Wilkes, "The Gentle Zapatistas" (January 16, 1915) reported (p. 57) on Zapata's first occupation of the capital, "whatever comes the people of Mexico City will keep the surprised memory of this week's gentle reign of the Zapatistas."

12. New York Times, March 18, 1919.

13. Ibid., April 12, 1919.

14. Edgcumb Pinchon, Zapata the Unconquerable (New York, 1941), 228-229, n. 2. See also Jerry Knudson, "Judgment Day in Morelos: Emiliano Zapata and Agrarian Reform, 1909-1919," in Essays in History (Charlottesville, 1962), 17, n. 10.

15. Antonio D. Melgarejo, Los crímenes del Zapatismo, Apuntes de un guerrillero (Mexico, D.F., 1913?) To a credulous public, Melgarejo announced that Zapata crucified priests, skinned the feet of a prisoner and then made him dance the jarabe, and detonated a stick of dynamite after inserting it in the rectum of a Federal soldier. Ibid., 131, 102 and 104.

16. At times Dunn wrote under the pseudonym of Ramón Jurado. The following articles, all by Dunn, appeared in The Wide World Magazine: "The Master-Bandit" (September 1912), 523-534; "Expelled from Mexico, The Striking Sequel to a 'Wide World' Story" (February 1913), 430-439; "The Escape of Manuel Gonzales" (July 1913), 342-347; "Gun-Running with Zapata" (January 1914), 309-319; "More About the Master Bandit" (April 1916), 14-25, and "A Bandit's Bride, A Girl's Strange Life-Story" (June 1917), 177-186; (July 1917), 309-317, and (August 1917), 403-442.

17. Quoted in "Zapata in Action," The Literary Digest (April 6, 1912), 716-717.

18. Harry H. Dunn, The Crimson Jester, Zapata of Mexico (New York, 1933), 44-45. In his preface, Dunn stated (p. x) that Zapata was "the greatest bandit the Americas have seen. Quite possibly he was the most powerful and the most destructive outlaw in the known history of the entire world." The best biography of Zapata in any language is John Womack, Jr., Zapata and the Mexican Revolution (New York, 1969).

19. Quoted in The North American Review (February 1914), 181.

20. John A. Avirette, "Mexico's Trouble Maker," Collier's (February 24, 1912), 27.

21. New York Times, March 18, 1919.

22. Pinchon, Zapata the Unconquerable, 227.

23. La Nación (La Paz, Bolivia), October 3, 1959.

24. Michael J. Francis, "The U.S. Press and Castro: A Study in Declining Relations," Journalism Quarterly (Summer 1967), 257-266. See also Joseph Fenley, "An Analysis of Editorials on Castro and Cuba Appearing in The New York Times from December 2, 1956, to January 3, 1963," M.A. thesis, University of Missouri, 1963.

25. New York Daily News, January 22, 1960.

26. San Francisco Examiner, January 23, 1960.

27. Philadelphia Inquirer, March 8, 1960.

28. Miami Herald, July 8, 1960.

29. Detroit News, March 9, 1960.

30. Francis, "The U.S. Press and Castro," 263.

31. Jules Dubois, "The Fight for Freedom in Latin America," Eleventh Annual William Allen White Memorial Lecture, University of Kansas (February 10, 1960), 19. The rhetoric of the Cold War was evident in this speech, which decried (p. 9) "the agitation and subversion of the communist conspiracy in the global master plan of the Kremlin for world domination."

32. Maurice Zeitlin and Robert Scheer, Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere (New York, 1963), 284. Magazines examined were Life, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News & World Report, Reader's Digest, Look, Saturday Evening Post and Coronet. The magazine articles were most concerned with the issue of communism and secondly with Cuba-U.S. relations. The authors also studied three newspapers--the Washington Post, San Francisco Chronicle and San Francisco Examiner--published between January 1, 1959, and October 19, 1960. They found (pp. 286-302) that most of the Cuban news centered on Cuba-U.S. relations or counter-revolutionary activities within Cuba. Ninety-seven percent of news stories originating from Cuba came from Havana. The authors charged (p. 293) that "our newspapermen preferred remaining in Havana to the often arduous task of interviewing peasants, investigating rural cooperatives, new hospitals, and schools."

33. Neal D. Houghton, "The Cuban Invasion of 1961 and the U.S. Press, in Retrospect," Journalism Quarterly (Summer 1965), 424.

34. Misplaced values were evident, for example, in Tad Szulc, "Cuba: Anatomy of a Failure," Look (July 18, 1961), 76-82. Clifton Daniel, managing editor of the New York Times, in justifying suppression of invasion news before the World Press Institute at St. Paul, Minn., in 1966, regretted the Bay of Pigs operation only because if it had been canceled, "the country would have been saved enormous embarassment..." New York Times, June 2, 1966. Few journalists seemed to consider the effect of the invasion upon the Cubans.

35. James Aronson, Packaging the News, A Critical Survey of Press, Radio, TV (New York, 1971), Chapter 10, "Cuba and Vietnam," 70. See also Aronson, The Press and the Cold War (Boston, 1970), Chapter 11, "The Bay of Pigs," 153-169, and Chapter 12, "The Missile Crisis," 170-179. For a critical account of the New York Times' handling of the invasion, see Victor Bernstein and Jesse Gordon, "The Press and the Bay of Pigs," The Columbia University Forum (Fall 1967), 5-13.

36. Dom Bonafede, "The Press in the Cuban Fiasco," Nieman Reports (July 1961), 5-6.

37. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. A Thousand Days, John F. Kennedy in the White House (Boston, 1965), 261.

38. Steffens filed dispatches from Mexico while accompanying the forces of Venustiano Carranza; Steffens later claimed that he wrote much of the Mexican Constitution of 1917. Reed followed Pancho Villa, later collecting his reports in Insurgent Mexico (New York, 1914) before going on to cover the Russian revolution and to write one of the classics of modern journalism, Ten Days That Shook the World (New York, 1919).

39. Matthews has presented his own account in The Cuban Story (New York, 1961) and A World in Revolution, A Newspaperman's Memoir (New York, 1971). In the latter, see especially Chapter 8, "Cuba," 293-336, and Chapter 9, "Cuba and The Times," 337-365. An interesting exchange of letters between Matthews and Theodore Draper is found in the latter's Castro's Revolution, Myths and Realities (New York, 1962), Appendix Two, 185-199.

40. Gay Talese, "The Kingdoms, the Powers, and the Glories of the New York Times," Esquire (November 1966), 203. See also "The Penance of Matthews," The Nation (October 31, 1966), 437-438. Matthews published an account of his

1963 visit in a monograph, "Return to Cuba," issued by the California Institute of International Studies (Stanford, 1964) and a brief report of his 1967 trip, "Fidel Castro Revisited" in War/Peace Report (December 1967), 3-5.

41. Thurston N. Davis, S.J., "The Lid Life of Herbert Matthews," America (August 26, 1961), 660.

42. Herbert L. Matthews, The Yoke and the Arrows, A Report on Spain (New York, 1961), 225.

43. Lee Lockwood, Castro's Cuba, Cuba's Fidel (New York, 1969), 336.

44. Marvin Alisky, "The Cuba Nobody Knew," Nieman Reports (April 1959), 2. See also his earlier studies of the Cuban press under Batista, "Havana Havoc: Too Many Dailies, Subsidies Corrupt Crowded Cuban Journalism," ibid. (April 1956), 16-18, and "Cuban Press: Censorship Replaces Bribery," ibid. (April 1957), 17-18.

45. Mervin Block, "The Night Castro 'Unmasked,'" Columbia Journalism Review (Summer 1962), 7.

46. In addition to articles cited below, see Bob Kamman, "Dr. Allende and the Red Herring," Chicago Journalism Review (April 1971), 14; John Pollock, "Reporting on Chile: What the Press Leaves Out," The Nation (January 29, 1973), 134-138; Pollock with David Eisenhower, "The New Cold War in Latin America: The U.S. Press and Chile," in Dale Johnson, ed., The Chilean Road to Socialism (New York, 1973), 71-86; Ted Pearson, "Coverage of Chile: 'Preconceived, Wishful View,'" Chicago Journalism Review (November 1973), 3-5; Pollock and Torry Dickinson, "Apologists for Terror: The Chilean Junta and the U.S. Press," Worldview (March 1974), 27-32, and John and Michele Pollock, The U.S. Press and Chile: Ideology and International Conflict (New York, 1974). For what happened in the Chilean press, see Patricia Fagen, "The Media in Allende's Chile," Journal of Communication (Winter 1974), 59-70; Michael Sanders, "Book Burning and Brutality," Index (Spring 1974), 7-16, and International Organization of Journalists, "The Present Situation of the Press in Chile"(n.p., n.d. [after the overthrow of Allende]).

47. Jerry Knudson, "Improve Coverage of Chile," Letters, The Quill (April 1973), 7.

48. Philadelphia Bulletin, June 24, 1973.

49. Ibid., September 30, 1973.

50. John Pollock with Torry Dickinson and Joseph Somma, "Did Eichmann Have a Sense of Humor? The New York Times and

Militarism in Chile," Latin American Studies Association Newsletter (December 1973), 35.

51. Best television coverage of the Chilean coup was by CBS, except for the footage of the bombing of La Moneda, the government palace, shown on NBC.

52. Robert N. Pierce, "Lights Out in Santiago," The Quill (January 1974), 17-21. See also letter by Jerry Knudson, "Was Allende Murdered?" ibid. (March 1974), 7.

53. New York Times, September 20, 1973.

54. Gabriel García Márquez, "The Death of Salvador Allende," translated by Gregory Rabassa, Harper's Magazire (March 1974), 53. On the other hand, The Reasoner Report of ABC interviewed in February 1974 a Dr. Guijón who claimed to have seen Allende shoot himself. Arthur Holch, producer of The Reasoner Report, commented, "I asked Orlando Letelier and other former Allende officials how they would rate Dr. Guijón's account. They told me they see no reason to doubt his veracity." Letter from Holch, April 1, 1974.

55. Manuel Mejido, Esto pasó en Chile (México, D.F., 1974).

56. Pablo Neruda, Incitación al Nixonicidio y alabanza de la Revolución Chilena (México, D.F., 1973). The writer of this paper has prepared another on U.S. press coverage of the death of Neruda, titled, "A Chilean Poet Dies--So What?"

57. Letter from Senator Richard S. Schweiker (R.-Pa.), October 11, 1973.

58. Pat Chain, "Press Coverage of the Chilean Coup: The Information Gap," Community Action on Latin America Newsletter (October 1973), 1-4.

59. John Barnes, "Slaughterhouse in Santiago," Newsweek (October 8, 1973), 53-54, and E. Bradford Burns, "Reform Gunned Down: True Verdict on Allende," The Nation (October 29, 1973), 422-426. For rebuttal, see Pablo Huneeus, "Those Horror Tales from Chile..." and Everett G. Martin, "...and a Few Loud Echoes from Academia," Wall Street Journal, November 2, 1973. See also Kenneth Auchincloss, "Newsweek Replies on Chile," ibid., November 15, 1973, and Laurence R. Birns, "Chile in The Wall Street Journal," The Nation (December 3, 1973), 581-587.

60. Richard Maxwell Brown, "Violence and the American Revolution," in Stephen G. Kurtz and James H. Hutson, eds., Essays on the American Revolution (Chapel Hill, 1973), 116.

61. Beatrice F. Hyslop, "The American Press and the French Revolution of 1789," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society (February 1960), 84.

62. Mills, Listen, Yankee, 9.

63. Actually, the United States today has a mixed economic system, with governmental intervention in the economy generally in favor of the wealthy and established, a system that has been called "socialism for the rich."

64. The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States does prohibit deprivation of "life, liberty, or property" without due process of law, and this prohibition was extended to state governments through the Fourteenth Amendment adopted in 1868. On the other hand, of the 27 specific indictments of George III in the Declaration of Independence, only three concern property: taxes, trade and appropriations of lands. The major thrust of both the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights was to place much greater emphasis on personal rights other than the ownership of property.

65. The relationship between the political thought of Locke and Jefferson is not as simple as this, of course. For detailed discussions of a complex issue, see Carl Becker, The Declaration of Independence, A Study in the History of Political Ideas (New York, 1922), 62-73, and Edward Dumbauld, The Declaration of Independence and What It Means Today (Norman, 1950), 60-63.